

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO). F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/634,450	0/634,450 08/05/2003		Naofumi Yamauchi	S004-5084	6710	
40627	7590	04/14/2006		EXAMINER		
ADAMS	& WILKS		NGUYEN, THANH NHAN P			
17 BATTE SUITE 123	ERY PLACI 31	E		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
NEW YORK, NY 10004				2871	<u>-</u>	
				DATE MAILED: 04/14/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

(A	
Υ'	١

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)		
10/634,450	YAMAUCHI ET	YAMAUCHI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit	9		
(Nancy) Thanh-Nhan P. Nguyen	2871			

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	÷				
	(Nancy) Thanh-Nhan P. Nguyen	2871					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 31 March 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.					
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
 a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO 							
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)		NOT KEI ET WASTIELI	J WITTING TWO				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened sta above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compof filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)) be filed within the time period set for), to avoid dismissal on orth in 37 CFR 41.37(of the appeal. a).				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brie	f, will <u>not</u> be entered l	because				
(a) ☑ They raise new issues that would require further co		TE below);					
(b) \square They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	ow);						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		jected claims.	•				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).	llowable if submitted in a separate	, timely filed amendm	ent canceling				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ill be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 9-11,15-23,29 and 30. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 12-14.							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> reject <mark>ions under appe</mark> y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	ched.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered busee continuation sheet.	it does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)					
13. Other:	, , , ,	. , ,					
	•						

Claim 29 has raised new issue that would require further consideration and/or search, such as, "and only one reflection-polarizing plate which is disposed over a second side of the liquid crystal panel ..." The "only one reflection-polarizing plate" changes the scope of the invention to compare with previous amended limitation, "a reflection-polarizing plate". Further, Examiner respectful disagree with Applicant on the Remarks, page 8, as "Independent claim 29 has been amended to correct the typographical error pointed out by the Examiner to make more clear that the liquid crystal display has only one reflection-polarizing plate." In Final Rejection Office Action (dated 11/30/2005), Examiner only objected claim 29 for typographical error, and suggested Applicant to correct "form" by "from"; Examiner absolutely did not indicate correcting the typographical error to make more clear that the liquid crystal display has only one reflection-polarizing plate.

NDREW SCHECHTER PRIMARY EXAMINER